

Serial No. 09/595,622
Atty. Docket No. 70655.8100

REMARKS

Applicant hereby responds to the Office Action mailed on January 20, 2004, within the three month extension period. Claims 1-35 were pending in the application and the Examiner rejects claims 1-35. Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, Claims 1-11 and 13-35 are pending and applicant asserts that the application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the pending claims is requested.

The Examiner objects claim 29 due to a typographical error informality. Applicant amends claim 29 to clarify that the computer system serves a document.

The Examiner rejects claim 12 under 35 USC 112 because the Examiner asserts that deselection of the user profile is unclear. To expedite prosecution of this case, applicant cancels claim 12 with prejudice or estoppel from filing one or more claims having similar subject matter in additional patent applications.

The Examiner next rejects claims 1-35 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Markus (6,490,601). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The Examiner first notes that Markus has a common assignee, so the rejection may be overcome if the invention disclosed, but not claimed, in Markus was created by G.W. Simons, the inventor of this application, so it is not an invention "by another". Applicant is still researching Mr. Simon's contribution to the Markus invention, so applicant reserves its rights to file a 37 CFR 1.132 declaration if applicant determines that the Mr. Simons' contributions meet such requirements.

With respect to the specific rejections based upon Markus, applicants have amended the independent claims to include additional elements, so the Examiner's rejections are now moot. For example, applicant added a "fill server" which accepts a form and builds a map based on the form wherein the map facilitates filling in the fields. In contrast, Markus requires that each map be associated with a registered electronic form. Applicant also added "creating a plurality of user profiles" which is not disclosed or suggested by Markus. Moreover, the dependent claims include all the limitations of the amended independent claims, so the dependent claims are patentable for the same or similar reasons for differentiating the independent claims from Markus.


Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. No new matter is added in this Response. Reconsideration of the application is thus requested. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any

Serial No. 09/595,622
Atty. Docket No. 70655.8100

overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2814. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed. Applicant invites the Office to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response or the present application in general.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 19, 2004

By: 
Howard Sobelman
Reg. No. 39,038

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
400 E. Van Buren
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Phone: 602-382-6228
Fax: 602-382-6070
Email: hsobelman@swlaw.com